DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 509 CS 501 552

AUTHOR Pickett, Terry A.; Sussman, Lyle
TITLE Causal Attributions and Perceived Source Credibility: Theory, Data, and Implications.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 24p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Credibility; Higher Education; *Information Theory; *Locus of Control; *Persuasive Discourse; Research

ABSTRACT

A general framework for viewing the relationship between attribution processes and perceived source credibility is proposed. Based upon this framework, an experimental study was conducted examining perceived source credibility as a function of causal attributions in messages. Three independent variables were incorporated into a 2x2x2 factorial design. The first independent variable referred to the nature of the outcome (favorable/unfavorable). The remaining two independent variables referred to the causal attributions used by the source to explain the outcome: locus of control (internal/external) and stability (stable/unstable). Four factors of source credibility served as dependent variables: trustworthiness, expertness, dynamism, and objectivity. Results confirmed the general hypothesis that perceived source credibility is significantly affected by attributions conveyed in messages. A self-aggrandizement principle is proposed as a consistent explanation for the specific results. Exploratory findings are incorporated into the discussion, and suggestions for future research are proposed. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131509

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CAUSAL ATTRIBUTIONS AND PERCEIVED SOURCE CREDIBILITY: THEORY, DATA, AND IMPLICATIONS

by

Terry A. Pickett and Lyle Sussman

Department of Speech
University of Pittsburgh

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICRO FICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Terry A. Pickett
Lyle Sussman
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

ABSTRACT

A general framework for viewing the relationship between attribution processes and perceived source credibility is proposed. Based upon this framework an experimental study was conducted examining perceived source credibility as a function of causal attributions contained in messages. Three independent variables were incorporated into a 2x2x2 factorial design. The first independent variable referred to the Nature of the Outcome (Favorable, Unfavorable). The remaining two independent variables referred to the causal attributions used by the source to explain the outcome: Locus of Control (Internal, External) and Stability (Stable, Unstable). Four factors of source credibility served as dependent variables: Trustworthiness, Expertness, Dunamism, and Objectivity. Results confirmed the general hypothesis that perceived source credibility is significantly affected by attributions conveyed in messages. A self-aggrandizement principle is proposed as a consistent explanation for the specific results. Exploratory findings are incorporated into the discussion and suggestions for future research are proposed.

CS 501 552

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Crucial to the human communication process are the inferences persons make about the causes of observed behavior. Answering the question "What caused him to do that?" is central to ascribing meaning to his actions. Attribution, the behavior of the average individual in attempting to infer the underlying causes of observed behavior, may be the incipient phase of human communication.

In analyzing attribution processes the communication researcher can approach attributions as being antecendent or subsequent to message generation and transmission. In the former category, understanding the dynamics that intervene between data input and message creation can further illuminate the dynamics of human information processing. In addition, once a "cause" for an action has been tentatively designated, further communication may be predisposed in systematic manners. In the latter category, the researcher would be interested in the effects that messages which explicitly or implicitly reflect attributions have on transceivers and their relationship.

While there has been scant research concerning the antecedent role of attributions, especially their effects upon the nature and content of future communication, there has been growing interest in the Speech Communication fiel concerning its subsequent role. One area in which the subsequential study of attributions is directly applicable is source credibility.

The research paradigm for the typical source credibility study includes a sender (S), a message (M), and a receiver (R). If one considers M as a conveyor of S's attributions, then R's reaction to S as a credible source may be viewed in attributional terms. In short, attributions contained in M can be theoretically linked to perceptions of S's credibility. The present study examines this theoretical link between attribution and source credibility by focusing on those attribution factors central to any causal explanation--locus of causality.

Attribution and Locus of Causality

Central to the understanding and study of attribution processes in human communication is the basic nature of the causal explanation, locus of causality. In his landmark formulation of attribution theory, Heider proposed that

> ...behavior can be ascribed primarily to the person or to the environment; that is, behavior can be accounted for by the relatively stable traits of the personality or by factors within the environment.[1]

While subsequent formulations of attribution theory have elaborated upon Heider's basic statements, this causal locus dichotomy has been retained as a central feature.[2]

Weiner, et al.,[3] further elaborated this internal-external attributional dichotomy in their analysis of achievement motivation. They proposed a classification scheme in which attributions about the causes of success and failure can refer to two constituent factors: "Locus of Control" and "Stability." This classification scheme is presented in Figure 1.

Insert Figure 1 Here

Internal Locus of Control refers to qualities internal to the person undertaking the task (ability and effort), while External Locus of Control refers to qualities external to that person (task difficulty and luck). Additionally, Stability refers to elements that have some enduring quality (ability and task difficulty), while Instability refers to elements that are relatively variable (effort and luck). Thus, given the theoretical framework provided by Weiner et al, an outcome may be attributed to one of four causal loci: Internal-Stable (ability), Internal-Unstable (effort), External-Stable (task difficulty), and External-Unstable (luck).

Hypotheses

While the effect of Stable and Unstable factors upon attributions for success and failure have not been fully and experimentally examined, several research studies indicate that persons tend to attribute success to "internal" factors and failure to "external" factors.[4] Further, Kaplan and Sharp[5] reported that when the perpetrator of an act is seen as responsible for that act, he is (1) seen as more safe, dynamic and qualified when the act had favorable consequences for the subject, and (2) seen as less safe, but more dynamic and qualified when the act had unfavorable consequences for the subject. In addition, Berger[6] has recently presented data indicating that sources of information whose attributions are consistent with a receiver's attributions will be viewed as more attractive by the receiver than sources wh attributions are inconsistent.

On the basis of findings reported above, we hypothesize the following:

H_1: When favorable outcomes are communicated, sources of such information will be perceived as more credible when they attribute the outcome to internal factors (ability and effort) than when they attribute the outcome to external factors (task difficulty and luck).

H_2: When unfavorable outcomes are communicated, sources of such information will be perceived as more credible when they attribute the outcome to external factors (task difficulty and luck) than when they attribute the outcome to internal factors (ability and effort).

H_3: Sources of information that communicate favorable outcomes attributed to internal factors (ability and effort) will be perceived as more credible than sources of information that communicate unfavorable outcomes attributed to internal factors (ability and effort).

H_4: Sources of information that communicate unfavorable outcomes attributed to external factors (task difficulty and luck) will be perceived as more credible than sources of information that communicate favorable outcomes attributed to external factors (task difficulty and luck).

The dependent variable, credibility, is operationalized in this study as incorporating four dimensions: Expertness, Dynamism, Trustworthiness and Objectivity.[7] Thus, by choosing the term "credibility" in each of the hypothese we are examining its constituent factors but are treating these four factors

as exploratory. That is, no specific directional hypotheses are posed for Expertness, Dynamism, Trustworthiness or Objectivity. We base this decision on the rationale that while prior research provides strong evidence that a person's perception of a message source is affected by the source's attributions, there is no firm empirical base upon which to stipulate which of the credibility factors is most (least) "responsive" to causal attributions.

Similarly, the effect on source credibility of the Stability or Instability of causes cited within messages has not been subjected to prior research. Thus, we also treat the study of this attribution variable, in terms of main and interaction effects, as exploratory.

Procedure

Subjects for the experiment were 128 undergraduate students at the University of Pittsburgh enrolled in speech-communication classes during the 1974 fall session. Sixteen subjects were randomly assigned to each of eight experimental conditions.

Each subject read a message purported to have been delivered by Mr. John Nelson, student body president of Excalibur University, to the student body of Excalibur University. Eight messages were composed, one for each cell of a 2x2x2 factorial involving two types of outcome (Favorable or Unfavorable), two types of locus of control (Internal or External), and two types of causal stability (Stable or Unstable). The name of the source and the University are fictitious thus controlling for any prior attitudes towards the speaker or institution. This specific message context was chosen because it appeared at face validity to have relevance for the subjects.

Four of the eight messages described a Favorable outcome (the University's acceptance of student participation in senate meetings) and four described an Unfavorable outcome (the university's rejection of student participation in

senate meetings). Additionally, each messages explicitly attributed the outcome to either luck, effort, ability or task difficulty. Thus, the eight experimental treatments are as follows:

1. Favorable outcome attributed to luck ("We were lucky.").
2. Unfavorable outcome to luck ("We were unlucky.").
3. Favorable outcome to effort ("We tried hard enough.").
4. Unfavorable outcome to effort ("We didn't try hard enough.").
5. Favorable outcome to ability ("We had the necessary skill and knowledge.").
6. Unfavorable outcome to ability ("We didn't have the necessary skill and knowledge.").
7. Favorable outcome to task difficulty ("It was an easy task.").
8. Unfavorable outcome to task difficulty ("It was a very difficult task.").

Each experimental message contained four segments. The first segment was a statement introducing the message which was held constant across all eight conditions. The second segment contained the statement of the nature of the outcome. The third segment contained the speaker's attributions about the cause of the outcome. The third segment concluded the message and was also held constant across all eight conditions. Figure 2 presents an example of one of the eight experimental messages.

Insert Figure 2 Here

All messages were validated on three criteria by a panel of four faculty members in the Department of Speech and Theatre Arts, University of Pittsburgh: 1) the message clearly incorporated favorability or unfavorability of outcome, 2) the message clearly attributed the outcome to only luck, ability, effort or task difficulty, 3) the message controlled all other extraneous variables.

The messages and data gathering instruments were contained in a four page booklet. The first page contained instructions on filling out the instruments and set the context for the message. The second page contained one of the eight experimental messages. The third and fourth pages contained thirty-one semantic differnetial scales used to measure perceived source credibility.

The four dimensions of source credibility were measured using thirty-one semantic differential scales presented by Applbaum and Anatol[8] (see Table 1).

Insert Table 1 Here

Data were tabulated by summing the scores for the scales composing each of the four credibility factors. These scores were then summed for the sixteen subjects in each cell of the 2x2x2 factorial design.

Results

A 2x2x2 factorial, equal n analysis of variance was conducted for each of the four factors of source credibility (Trustworthiness, Expertness, Dynamism, and Objectivity). The .05 level of significance was established for all statistical tests. Results of the four 2x2x2 ANOVAs are presented in Table 2. In addition, cell means for the four credibility factors of the hypothesized interactions are presented in Table 3. Discussion of the data contained in Tables 2 and 3 will be organized and presented in terms of significant effects for the four dependent measures.

Insert Tables 2 and 3 Here

TRUSTWORTHINESS. The hypothesized interaction between nature of outcome (F) and locus of control (I) approached but did not reach the .05 level of significance. However, there was a significant main effect for nature of outcome such that sources of Favorable outcomes ($\bar{X}$=63.05) were seen as more trustworthy than sources of Unfavorable outcomes ($\bar{X}$=57.44).

EXPERTNESS. There were significant main effects for the nature of the outcome and stability of the cited cause. Sources of Favorable outcomes ($\bar{X}$=47.39) were seen as more expert than sources of Unfavorable outcomes ($\bar{X}$=42.75). Sources citing Stable causes ($\bar{X}$=57.55) were seen as more expert than sources citing Unstable causes ($\bar{X}$=42.60).

The hypothesized interaction between nature of outcome (F) and locus of control (I) was significant. An analysis of simple interaction effects[9] reveals that (1) sources attributing Favorable outcomes to Internal factors ($\bar{X}$=51.69) were seen as more expert than sources attributing Unfavorable outcomes to Internal factors ($\bar{X}$=41.97) ($F(1,120)=11.959$, $p < .005$); and (2) sources attributing Favorable outcomes to Internal causes ($\bar{X}$=51.59) were seen as more expert than sources attributing Favorable outcomes to External factors ($\bar{X}$=43.13) ($F(1,120)=9.282$, $p < .005$).

DYNAMISM: There was a significant main effect for nature of outcome (F) such that sources conveying Favorable outcomes ($\bar{X}$=26.28) were seen as more dynamic than sources conveying Unfavorable outcomes ($\bar{X}$=20.94).

The hypothesized interaction between nature of outcome (F) and locus of control (I) was not significant. There was, however, a significant three-way interaction. Decomposition of this interaction revealed the following significant differences. First, sources attributing Favorable outcomes to Internal-Stable factors ("ability"--$\bar{X}$=28.94) were seen as more dynamic than sources attributing Unfavorable outcomes to Internal-Stable factors ("ability" -- $\bar{X}$=19.63) ($F(1,120)=26.718$, $p < .001$). Second, sources attributing Favorable outcomes to External Unstable factors ("luck" -- $\bar{X}$=25.56) were seen as more dynamic than sources attributing Unfavorable outcomes to External Unstable factors ("luck" -- $\bar{X}$=18.69)($F(1,120)=11.056$, $p < .005$). Third, sources attributing Favorable outcomes to Internal-Stable factors ("ability" -- $\bar{X}$=28.94) were seen as more dynamic than sources attributing Favorable outcomes to External-Stable factors ("task difficulty" -- $\bar{X}$=24.13)($F(1,120)=5.417$, $p < .05$). Finally, sources attributing Unfavorable outcomes to Internal-Stable factors ("effort" - $\bar{X}$=22.81) were seen as more dynamic than sources attributing Unfavorable outcomes to External-Unstable factors ("luck" -- $\bar{X}$=18.69)($F(1,120)=3.98$, $p < .05$).

Discussion

White has posited that one of man's primary motives is "effectance"[10]— to be in effective interaction with his environment. In the process of understanding predicting and controlling his environment, man relies heavily upon his subjective explanation of the underlying causes of behavior. Communication processes can appropriately be viewed as sharing this same goal of effectance.[11] We agree with Berger that the "communication process is a crucial one for reducing uncertainty in order to maintain some degree of adaptation to one's environment."[12] From this perspective the results pertinent to the study's hypotheses suggest that subjects processed information in accordance with a self-aggrandizement principle. They appeared to prefer information and causal explanations that implied enhancement of their ability to succeed and control their environment. In turn, this preference affected their reactions to the sources of such information. We will elaborate on this interpretation by discussing the results of each of the four hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1. We predicted that sources would be perceived as more credible when they attributed Favorable outcomes to Internal rather than External causes. This hypothesis was supported for Expertness directly and for Dynamism indirectly (stable causes only). Results were in the predicted direction (and approached significance) for Trustworthiness. There was no support for Objectivity.

In general, it is more self-enhancing to have Favorable outcomes attributed to our ability and effort rather than to luck or an easy task. Internal attributions increase our sense of being effective actors and performing well. External attributions on the other hand, imply that we have relatively little control over the consequences that befall us. Concluding that we produced Favorable outcomes may infer that in the future we will again be able to similarly control our environment. In short, this interpretation suggests that persons prefer attributions which have positive implications for their sense of

of control. External attributions, on the other hand, imply that fate is at the mercy of fickle and uncontrollable environmental forces. Thus, when the source of the experimental messages explained Favorable outcomes on the basis of Internal rather than External causes he was perceived as more Trustworthy, Expert, and Dynamic.

Hypothesis 2. We predicted that sources would be perceived as more credible when they attributed Unfavorable outcomes to External causes rather than Internal causes. While results for Trustworthiness and Expertness tended to be in the predicted direction, the only statistically significant finding was for Dynamism which was in the direction opposite to that hypothesized. While these results are not consistent enough to warrant any firm conclusions, some tentative explanations may be advanced.

When sources attempt to explain the causes of Unfavorable outcomes they may be perceived as rationalizing failure. This can be especially true when the source is seen as responsible for the outcome.[13] In the experimental messages John Nelson was presented as the president of the student body. Subjects could therefore presume that he was the primary agent acting on their behalf. Consequently, his attempt to explain failure on the basis of bad luck or insurmountable task difficulty might have been seen as an attempt to rationalize and thereby avoid responsibility for failure. In contrast, attributing Unfavorable outcomes to Internal causes not only implies acceptance of blame, but also implies that increased effort in the future might preclude similar negative outcomes.

Hypothesis 3. We predicted that sources would be perceived as more credible when they attributed Favorable outcomes to Internal causes than when they attributed Unfavorable outcomes to Internal causes. This hypothesis was directly supported for Expertness indirectly for Dynamism. Results were in the predicted direction for Trustworthiness. There was no support for Objectivity

It appears that we prefer to have success attributed to our ability and effort rather than failure attributed to our lack of ability and effort. Again, the former attributions have more self-enhancing implications than the latter. We prefer to have our success rather than our failure attributed to self. Given these preferences, subjects saw the source as more Trustworthy, Expert, and Dynamic when he attributed success to ability and effort than when he attributed failure to a lack of ability and effort.

Hypothesis 4. This hypothesis predicted that sources would be seen as more credible when they attributed Unfavorable outcomes to External causes than when they attributed Favorable outcomes to External causes. This hypothesis was not supported for any of the four credibility factors. Moreover, results were in the opposite direction for Trustworthiness and Dynamism. While attribution of Unfavorable outcomes to External forces enables us to "save face" and escape responsibility for failure, it also may preclude the possibility of preventing negative consequences in the future. The implication is that we are at the mercy of unpredictable and uncontrolable malevolent forces. Attributing Favorable outcomes to External forces, however, implies a less malevolent environment.

In general, two other findings need to be noted. First, the fairly consistent appearence of the Favorability main effect partially confirms results reported by Berger[14] that we are attracted to information sources who provide data congruent with our own preferences. Receivers were positively disposed towards information sources who reported Favorable rather than Unfavorable outcomes. Each of the experimental messages dealt with student participation in university governance. Assuming that most, if not all, students prefer such participation, it is understandable that they would be positively disposed toward a source who conveyed this preferential outcome.

Second, none of the analyses produced any statistically significant data concerning the Objectivity factor of source credibility. Since one of the secondary purposes of this study was to examine which of the source credibility factors was most (least) responsive to attributions contained in messages, we might conclude on the basis of our design that Objectivity is least responsive. An explanation accounting for this lack of responsiveness is provided by Kelley.

> The ascription of an attribute to an entity amounts to a particular causal explanation of effects associated with that entity--reactions or responses to it, judgments and evaluations of it, etc. So all judgments of the type "Property X characterizes Entity Y" are viewed as causal attributions."[15]

In short, it would appear that when sources attribute success or failure to either internal or external factors, perceived Trustworthiness, Dynamism, and Expertness are salient properties of the source but Objectivity is not. That is, Objectivity may be an irrelevant property of the source when subjects are required to characterize sources who explain the reasons for their success or failure.

Summary of Exploratory Findings for Stability Variable

Analysis of the main effect for Expertness indicated that sources attributing outcomes to Stable causes (ability and task difficulty) were perceived as more Expert than sources attributing outcomes to Unstable causes (effort and luck). It appears that outcomes attributed to ability and task difficulty may have implied that the source possessed the requisite skills, knowledge and talent to produce the outcomes, especially since the source was an active agent in this context. Anyone's causal analysis could randomly cite effort and luck (Unstable, varient) as critical factors; however, the experienced and forthright analyzer (hence, Expert) would be more likely to assess the role of invariant factors (ability and task difficulty), as these factors naturally

would be crucial in future, similar situations. The citation of luck (good or bad) and effort (sufficient or insufficient) as the primary causes of an event may have implied that the source was really unsure of what actually caused the event, a surface and pedestrian analysis uncharacteristic of the Expert actor.

The Stability factor was also involved in a three-way interaction on Dynamism. Specifically, Favorable-Internal-Stable (superior ability) messages produced greater perceived Dynamism than either Favorable-External-Stable (excessive task ease) or Unfavorable-Internal-Stable (lack of ability). As Stability implies invariance over time, one's sense of control and the probability of producing positive outcomes in the future is increased the more success is attributed to ability rather than failure attributed to a lack of ability. While excessive task ease means that one can indeed succeed again on the same task, it does not carry enhancing inferences concerning ability on other, more difficult, tasks.

On the other hand, the message conditions of Unfavorable-Internal-Unstable (lack of effort) and Favorable-External-Unstable (good luck) produced greater perceived Dynamism than the Unfavorable-External-Unstable (bad luck) message condition. It appears that lack of effort is preferred to bad luck as causes for Unfavorable outcomes since increased effort could ward off the negative event in the future while luck may continue to be bad. We have control over one, not over the other.

Why Dynamism should be the only dependent variable affected by the confluence all three independent variables is of more than passing interest. The preceding explanation indicates that Stability played a crucial role in the perceptions of source's aggressiveness, emphaticness, boldness, activeness, and energeticness. The data suggest that perceptions of Dynamism are enhanced to the extent that messages portray participants as active creators of effects; they are depressed to the extent that participants are portrayed as passive recipients of effects.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between attribution processes and perceived source credibility. Four hypotheses predicting interaction effects between Locus of Causal Attribution and Favorability of outcome were tested. Two hypotheses were supported; two were not supported. Findings were discussed in terms of a self-aggrandizement and rationalization postulates.

Since the thrust of this study was partially exploratory, future research should be pursued in two areas. First, what would be the effect on perceived source credibility of more complex causal explanations (e.g., combining luck and effort)? Second, are there receiver predispositions (e.g., internal-external locus of control[16]) that may partially account for the filtering biases that affect their preceptions of source credibility in the attributional context? Both research directions could elaborate this study's findings.

As noted in the introduction to this paper, the attribution process is inextricably related to the communication process. The present study has provided data and interpretations indicating that attributions contained in messages do indeed affect perceived source credibility. That the relationship between the two processes is complex rather than simple should not repel communication researchers, but rather attract them. In the final analysis the complex relationship between attribution and communication highlights the heuristic potential for future investigation.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Fritz Heider, The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958), p. 56.

[2]For example see: Edward E. Jones and Keith E. Davis, "From Acts to Dispositions: The Attribution Process in Person Perception," in Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 2 (New York: Academic Press, 1965), pp. 219-266; Harold Kelley, "Attribution Theory in Social Psychology," Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 15 (1967), pp. 192-238; and Harold Kelley, "The Process of Causal Attribution," American Psychologist, 28 (1973), pp. 107-128.

[3]Bernard Weiner, Irene Frieze, Andy Kukla, Linda Reed, Stanley Rest, and Robert M. Rosenbaum, Perceiving the Causes of Success and Failure (Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1971).

[4]For example see: Thomas J. Johnson, Rhoda Feigenbaum and Marcia Weiby, "Some Determinants and Consequences of the Teacher's Perception of Causality," Journal of Educational Psychology, 55 (1964), pp. 237-246; Linda J. Beckman, "Effects of Students' Performance on Teachers' and Observers' Attributions of Causality," Journal of Educational Psychology, 61 (1970), pp. 76-82; Siegfried Streufert and Susan C. Streufert, "Effects of Conception Structure, Failure, and Success on Attribution of Causality and Interpersonal Attitudes," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11 (1969), pp. 138-147.

[5]Stuart J. Kaplan and Harry W. Sharp, Jr., "The Effect of Responsibility Attributions on Message Source Evaluation," Speech Monographs, 41 (Nov., 1974), 364-370.

[6]Charles, R. Berger, "Task Performance and Attributional Communication as Determinants of Interpersonal Attraction," Speech Monographs, 40 (Nov., 1973), pp. 280-286.

[7]These four factors were obtained from a synthesis conducted by Applebaum and Anatol. See: Ronald F. Applbaum and Karl E. E. Anatol, "The Factor Structure of Source Credibility as a Function of the Speaking Situation," Speech Mcnographs, 39 (Aug., 1972), pp. 216-222.

[8]Applbaum and Anatol synthesized their scales from: David K. Berlo, James B. Lemert, and Robert J. Mertz, "Dimensions for Evaluating the Acceptability of Message Sources," Public Opinion Quarterly, 33 (Winter, 1969-1970), pp. 563-570; James C. McCroskey, "Scales for the Measurement of Ethos," Speech Monographs, 33 (Mar., 1966), pp. 65-72; Jack L. Whitehead, "Factprs of Source Credibility," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54 (Feb.,1968), pp. 59-63.

[9]B. J. Winer, Statistical Principles in Experimental Design (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).

[10]R. W. White, "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence," Psychological Review, 66 (1962), pp. 297-333.

[11]Dean C. Barnlund, "Toward a Meaning-Centered Philosophy of Communication," Journal of Communication, 11 (1962), pp. 198-202.

[12]Charles R. Berger, "Attributional Communication, Situational Involvement, Self-Esteem and Interpersonal Attraction," Journal of Communication, 23 (1973), p. 303.

[13]Kaplan and Sharp

[14]Berger, "Attributional Communication, Situational Involvement, Self-Esteem and Interpersonal Attraction;" Berger, "Task Performance and Attributional Communication as Determinants of Interpersonal Attraction."

[15]Harold H. Kelley, "The Process of Causal Attribution," American Psychologist, 28 (Feb. 1973), p. 107.

[16]Julian B. Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs,80 (1966)pp.1-28.

STABILITY	LOCUS OF CONTROL	
	INTERNAL	EXTERNAL
STABLE	Ability	Task Difficulty
UNSTABLE	Effort	Luck

Figure 1. CLASSIFICATION SCHEME FOR THE PERCEIVED CAUSES OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE

I want to report to you the outcome of the university's decision concerning student participation in university senate meetings. As you are probably aware, this is a vital issue that has been of great concern to all of us for the past year. The resolution of this issue will have a significant impact on our careers here at Excalibur University. [First element , held constant across all eight messages] I unhappily inform you that today the administration voted to reject our proposal for student participation in the university senate. [Second element -- description of favorability or unfavorability of outcome] The reasons for this unfavorable outcome are clear to me -- we simply did not put in the time and effort and plain hard work that was necessary to attain our goal. [Third element -- causal attribution for the outcome] I do appreciate your support in this matter and know you agree with me when I say that Excalibur University has the potential to become one of the great institutions of higher learning in this country. [Fourth element -- held constant across all eight messages]

Figure 2. EXAMPLE OF EXPERIMENTAL MESSAGE

Table 1. SOURCE CREDIBILITY SCALES SYNTHESIZED BY APPLBAUM AND ANATOL

TRUSTWORTHINESS	EXPERTNESS	DYNAMISM	OBJECTIVITY
1. Trustworthy-Untrustworthy	1. Has professional manner-Lacks professional manner	1. Aggressive-Meek	1. Open-minded-Close-minded
2. Sociable-Unsociable	2. Expert-Inexpert	2. Emphatic-Hesitant	2. Objective-Subjective
3. Cheerful-Gloomy	3. Valuable-Worthless	3. Bold-Timid	3. Impartial-Partial
4. Right-Wrong	4. Intelligent-Unintelligent	4. Active-Passive	
5. Virtuous-Sinful	5. Reliable-Unreliable	5. Energetic-Tired	
6. Nice-Awful	6. Qualified-Unqualified		
7. Unselfish-Selfish	7. Informed-Uninformed		
8. Pleasant-Unpleasant	8. Skilled-Unskilled		
9. Honest-Dishonest	9. Experienced-Inexperienced		
10. Friendly-Unfriendly	10. Trained-Untrained		
11. Kind-Cruel			
12. Just-Unjust			
13. Safe-Unsafe			

Table 2. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR DEPENDENT MEASURES

SOURCE	DEPENDENT VARIABLES							
	TRUSTWORTHINESS		EXPERTNESS		DYNAMISM		OBJECTIVITY	
	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F	MS	F
F	1096.88	9.124 c	689.13	5.453 a	913.78	26.718 d	6.57	0.433
I	99.76	0.903	395.51	3.129	94.53	2.764	5.69	0.376
S	239.26	2.168	785.07	6.212 a	6.13	0.179	14.45	0.953
F x I	424.13	3,843	825.19	6,530 a	42.78	1.250	6.57	0.433
F x S	192.57	1.745	1.76	0.013	0.13	0.003	9.57	0.631
I x S	39.38	0.356	53.82	0.425	21.13	0.617	15.82	1.044
F x I x S	29.07	0.263	67.57	0.534	242.01	7.046 b	2.25	0.149
ERROR	110.35		126.37		34.20		15.14	

a -- $p < .05$
b -- $p < .01$
c -- $p < .005$
d -- $p < .001$

F -- Favorability/Unfavorability
I -- Internal/External
S -- Stable/Unstable

Table 3. CELL MEANS FOR THE CREDIBILITY FACTORS IN THE NATURE OF OUTCOME x LOCUS OF CONTROL MESSAGE CONDITIONS

CREDIBILITY FACTORS	MESSAGE CONDITION			
	FAVORABLE INTERNAL	FAVORABLE EXTERNAL	UNFAVORABLE INTERNAL	UNFAVORABLE EXTERNAL
TRUSTWORTHINESS	65.75	60.34	56.50	58.38
EXPERTNESS	51.69	42.09	41.97	43.53
DYNAMISM	27.72	24.84	21.22	20.66
OBJECTIVITY	11.63	11.59	11.03	11.59

Means for TRUSTWORTHINESS could range from 13 to 91, for EXPERTNESS 10 to 70, for DYNAMISM 5 to 35, and for OBJECTIVITY 3 to 21. The higher the mean value, the more positively valenced the dimension.